Celestial (Plural) Marriage

Essential to Exaltation

Scriptures

"And in order to obtain the highest [degree in celestial glory – see v. 1], a man must enter into this order of the Priesthood (meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage);
And if he does not, he cannot obtain it."
(Instructions of Joseph Smith, 16 May 1843, D&C 131:2-3)

"for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same.
For behold I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory."
(Revelation to Joseph Smith, 12 July 1843, D&C 132:3-4, see v. 6,21,27,32)

"And I say again: Wo unto that nation or house or people who seek to hinder my people from obeying the Patriarchal Law of Abraham which leadeth to a celestial glory ..."
(Revelation to Wilford Woodruff, 26 January 1880, UR 79:32)

"This law is a Celestial law and pertains to a Celestial Kingdom.
... and appertains to thrones, principalities, powers, dominions, and eternal increase in the Celestial Kingdom of God."
(Revelation to John Taylor,25/6 June 1882, UR 80:21-22)

"All those who would enter into my glory must and shall obey my law.
And have I not commanded men that if they were Abraham's seed and would enter into my glory they must do the works of Abraham."
(Revelation to John Taylor Rev,September 1886, UR 88:7-8)

Joseph Smith

[He said,] It was a doctrine which pertained to Celestial Order and Glory.
William Clayton, Historical Record, 6:225-7

He [God] said to me that unless I accepted it and introduced it and practiced it, I, together with my people would be damned and cut off ...We have got to observe it. It is an eternal principle and was given by way of commandment and not by way of instruction.
Contributor 5:259

Brigham Young

The only men who become Gods, even the Sons of God, are those who enter into polygamy. Others attain unto a glory and may even be permitted to come into the presence of the Father and the Son; but they cannot reign as kings in glory, because they had blessings offered unto them, and they refused to accept them.
Journal of Discourses, Vol.11,p.268 - p.269, 19 August 1866

John Taylor

You seem desirous to take part of the law and reject the other part, but it is plainly stated as above quoted,

that they were "to do the works of Abraham, and that if ye enter not into my law, ye cannot receive the promise of my Father which was made unto Abraham." It is further said, "God commanded Abraham and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife, and the reason why she did it was because it was the law." It is evident, therefore, from the whole of the above that other wives are included in this law as well as the one.

Letter to Malinda Merrill, 19 January 1883.

Wilford Woodruff

Men may say that with their single marriage the same promises and blessings had been granted. "Why cannot I attain to as much as with three or four?" Many question me in this manner. I suppose they are afraid of [the] Edmunds [Tucker act].

What is the Covenant? It is the eternity of the marriage covenant, and includes a Plurality of Wives and takes both to make the law. The Lord leads the mind step by step to this point: First that all covenants must be made by his power; Next the eternity of the covenant reaching into Eternity; After this the Lord tells us what the Law is and how he justified his servants.

God commanded Abraham, and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham because this was the law ordained for the fullness and glory of God before the world was. This was the law and from Hagar sprang many nations.

The Lord has said that to whom this revelation is given, that they are eligible to this law, its blessings and its requirements. The men can only be saved by acts of righteousness and the woman are under the same law. Joseph Smith declared that all who became heirs of God and joint heirs of Christ must obey his Law, or they cannot enter into the fullness, and if they do not they may loose the one talent.

When men are offered knowledge and they refuse it they will be damned, and there is not a man that is sealed by this priesthood [except] by [which he] covenants to enter into the fullness of the Law, and the same with the woman - she says she will observe all that pertains to the New and Everlasting Covenant. Both are under the Covenant - and must obey if they wish to enter into a continuation of the lives or of the seeds.

(Utah Stake Quarterly Conference, 4 March 1883, Utah Stake Historical Record, 1877-88)

You ask[ed] some other questions concerning how many living wives a man must have to fulfill the law.

When a man, according to the revelation, marries a wife under the holy order which God has reveal[ed] and then marries another in the same way, he enters into the new and everlasting covenant, so far as he has gone he has obeyed the law.

(Letter to Bishop S.A. Woolley, Declarations of the First Presidency on Temple Work, Vol. 5:44; May 22, 1888.)

Joseph F. Smith

Some people have supposed that the doctrine of plural marriage was a sort of superfluity, or non-essential, to the salvation or exaltation of mankind. In other words, some of the Saints have said, and believe, that a man with one wife, sealed to him by the authority of the Priesthood for time and eternity, will receive an exaltation as great and glorious, if he is faithful, as he possibly could with more than one. I want here to enter my solemn protest against this idea, for I know it is false. There is no blessing promised except upon conditions, and no blessing can be obtained by mankind except by faithful compliance with the conditions, or law, upon which the same is promised. The marriage of one woman to a man for time and eternity by the sealing power, according to the will of God, is a fulfillment of the celestial law of marriage in part - and is good so far as it goes - and so far as a man abides these conditions of the law, he will receive his reward therefor, and this reward, or blessing, he could not obtain on any other grounds or conditions. But this is only the beginning of the law, not the whole of it. Therefore, whoever has imagined that he could obtain the fullness of the blessings pertaining to this celestial law, by complying with only a portion of its conditions, has deceived himself. He cannot do it.

Journal of Discourses, Vol.20, p.28 - p.29, Joseph F. Smith, 7 July 1878

As before stated no man can obtain the benefits of one law by the observance of another, however faithful he may be in that which he does, nor can he secure to himself the fullness of any blessing without he fulfills the law upon which it is predicated, but he will receive the benefit of the law he obeys. ... I understand the law of celestial marriage to mean that every man in this Church, who has the ability to obey and practice it in righteousness and will not, shall be damned, I say I understand it to mean this and nothing less, and I testify in the name of Jesus that it does mean that.

Journal of Discourses, Vol.20, p.31, Joseph F. Smith, 7 July 1878

The assistant recorder in the Salt Lake Temple informed the Church President that the idea was becoming common that "when a man receives one wife, under the Covenant, he thereby complies with the Celestial Order of marriage, and that his exaltation and eternal progression are just as certain as if he had received a plurality of wives." President Smith, at the next testimony meeting in the Salt Lake Temple on 5 January 1902, preached that "a man can not obtain a fullness, only through obedience to that law. He emphasized the fact, that it means must not can or may, etc."

Duncan M. McAllister to Joseph F. Smith, 19 Dec 1901. Smith Papers.
Joseph Christensen, Diary, 5 Jan 1902, LDS Church archives.
(as quoted in D. Michael Quinn, New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904, p. 91, Dialogue, Spring 1985)

First Presidency & Council of Twelve

We formerly taught to our people that polygamy, or celestial marriage as commanded by God through Joseph Smith, was right; that it was a necessity to man's highest exaltation in the life to come. That doctrine was publicly promulgated by our President, the late Brigham Young, forty years ago, and was steadily taught and impressed upon the Latter-day Saints up to a short time before September, 1890.

Petition for Amnesty, 19 December 1891.

Modern LDS Leaders

Plurality of wives was an incident, never an essential.

James E. Talmage, Story and Philosophy of Mormonism, p. 89

Plural marriage is not essential to salvation or exaltation.

Mormon Doctrine, p.578, Plural Marriage

"In early 1908 a committee consisting of Anthon H. Lund, Orson F. Whitney, Brigham H. Roberts, and James E. Talmage, after researching the question, recommended to the First Presidency that 'celestial marriage' not be equated exclusively with 'plural' or 'patriarchal' marriage."

Meeting of the Twelve Apostles, 17 Feb. 1908, Stanley Snow Ivins Collection, Uhi.

Plural Marriage Hymns

The Reformation

Now, sisters, list to what I say:
With trials this world is rife,
You can't expect to miss them all,
Help husband get a wife!

Now, this advice I freely give,
If exalted you would be,
Remember that your husband must
Be blessed with more than thee.

Then, oh, let us say,
God bless the wife that strives,
And aids her husband all she can
To obtain a dozen wives.

1856

Veneration

Through him who holds the sealing power,
Ye faithful ones, who heed
Celestial laws, take many wives,
And rear a righteous seed.

Though fools revile, I'll honor you,
As Abraham, my friend;
You shall be Gods, and shall be blest
With lives that never end.

Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs, 17th ed, 1881, no. 326.

Must live Plural Marriage to Preside
Over the Priesthood

Thus saith the Lord to the Twelve, and to the Priesthood and people of my Church:...You may appoint Seymour B. Young to fill up the vacancy in the presiding quorum of Seventies, if he will conform to My law: For it is not meet that men who will not abide My law shall preside over My Priesthood;

Revelation to John Taylor, October13th, 1882.

If we do not embrace that principle soon, the keys will be turned against us.* If we do not keep the same law our Heavenly Father has kept we cannot go with him. A man obeying a lesser law is not qualified to preside over those who keep a higher law.

John Taylor, October 10th, 1882.
Life of Wilford Woodruff,Matthias F. Cowley, p.542.

The leading men of Israel who are presiding over stakes will have to obey the law of Abraham, or they will have to stop.

Wilford Woodruff Journal,October 10th, 1882.

Can any man or set of men officiate in dispensing the laws and administering the ordinances of the Kingdom of God or of the kingdoms and governments of the world legally, without first obeying those laws and submitting to those ordinances themselves?...do not forget that no man has authority to officiate in the ordinances of heavenly or earthly governments only so far as he has obeyed them himself.

Brigham Young, October 8th, 1854.

Heber was told by Joseph that if he did not do this [take another wife] he would lose his Apostleship.

Life of Heber C. Kimball, Orson F. Whitney, p. 336 (1888 edition).

An angel of God ... told him [Joseph Smith] that, unless he moved forward and establish plural marriage, his Priesthood would be taken from him.

Eliza R. Snow, Biography and Family Record of Lorenzo Snow, p. 69-70.

* When this commandment was given, it was so far religious, and so far binding upon the Elders of this Church, that it was told them if they were not prepared to enter into it, and to stem the torrent of opposition that would come in consequence of it, the keys of the kingdom would be taken from them and given to others.

John Taylor, 7 June1866, Journal of Discourses 11:221-222.

Bishop John Sharp's superiors proffered that "any Priesthood holder who failed to sustain the law of God - polygamy - forfeited his right to rule in the midst of His people."

James B. Allen, Essays on Public Ethics, p. 48.

George Q. Cannon told young Joseph C. Bently that the only reason the elder Bently [his father] had not been advanced in the Church was because he had not taken additional wives.

Joseph T. Bentley, Life & Letters of Joseph C. Bentley, p. 77-85.

George Teasdale said to a meeting of Patriarchs in 1902 that they were unworthy of their office if they did not reverance a belief in Celestial Marriage.

Joseph W. Musser Diary, 11(& 17) November, 1902

Apostle John Henry Smith in a meeting of the First Presidency and Apostles, said that it was in practicing polygamy that men learned "the true order of government."

Rudger Clawson Diary, 7 January 1902.

Apostle Rudger Clawson urged that only women who believed in polygamy be appointed to Church positions. And newly called members of certain Stake Presidencies were asked to declare their willingness to put the doctrine into practice.

Rudger Clawson Diary, 16 January 1902 & 8 July 1903.
(see also Jessie L. Embry's interview with Theodore Bennion, 9 June 1976)

This situation was settled in an early day case where Heber J. Grant, as President of the Tooele Stake, attempted to correct Brother Samuel Woolley. Brother Grant was not living the law, while Brother Woolley was. The latter refused to receive instructions from Brother Grant, claiming immunity because the President was not living as high a law as he was. Brother Grant took the question up with his file leaders, President John Taylor and counselors. They instructed him that Brother Woolley was right, since he (Brother Grant) was not living or abiding in the law, he was not qualified to direct Brother Woolley who was faithfully abiding in that law. Thus, at the present time, few of the general authorities, stake presidents, or bishops are qualified to Preside over the Priesthood of God.

Joseph Musser Journal, p. 68-9.

Marriner W. Merrill in the early 1880's called Andrew L. Hyer to preside over the seventies quorum in Richmond, Utah. "But first you've got to take another wife," Merrill warned.

Jesse Embry, "Charles Edmund Richardson Families:
A Case Study of Mormon Polygamy", p. 4, unpublished paper.

In 1884 Taylor reported another revelation which urged monogamists to resign ecclesiastical offices in the Church.

Abraham H. Cannon Journal, 6 April 1884.

We have many Bishops and Elders who have but one wife. They are abundantly qualified to enter the higher law and take more, but their wives will not let them. Any man who permits a woman to lead him and bind him down is but little account in the Church and kingdom of God.

Wilford Woodruff, MatthiasF. Cowley, 490 (1909 edition).

Jerome Sweet claimed that he "went to a special priesthood meeting where Joseph F. Smith was the speaker and he said that men holding positions in the priesthood should either marry in polygamy or they should step down and let someone who would marry have the position."

Isn't One Wife Enough, Kimball Young, p. 107

Went to hear A. H. Cannon speak. Was surprised to hear my name read out by him as one recommended to become a Seventy.

Following questions were proposed to all who expected to be ordained: (1) Has your past life been commendable in the sight of God? (2) If not, can you overcome your weaknesses and keep pure before God? (3) Are you prepared to leave everything to go and stay upon missions till they are fulfilled? (4) Do you believe in the principle of Celestial Marriage and are you prepared when the time is made known to enter therein?

Thinking my mind was fully settled on those matters, I stepped forward and under the hands of A. H. Cannon and others was ordained a Seventy.

Journal of Douglas M. Todd, Sr, 27 February 1887.

Celestial (Plural) Marriage Will Never Cease

Thus saith the Lord ... I have not revoked this law nor will I for it is everlasting, and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof, even so, Amen.

27 September 1886, Revelation to John Taylor, Church History Office; Unpublished Revelations 88:1, 9.

The Lord told him the principle of Plural Marriage would never be overcome.

19 March 1892, John W. Taylor,Journal of Abraham H. Cannon.

Joseph Smith

It is an eternal principle, and was given by way of commandment and not by way of instruction.

Contributor 5:259; History of the Church 6:280; Teachings of the ProphetJoseph Smith p. 94.

Brigham Young

For so God help us, we will never give up that holy law that noble prophets laid down their lives to maintain. ... The powers of hell will do their utmost to get this people to give up that holy law which God designs to maintain.

Life of Mosiah Hancock p. 48.

John Taylor

It is an eternal part of our religion, and we will never relinquish it - We cannot withdraw or renounce it - He has promised to maintain it.

Millennial Star 47:708, 9 November 1855.

Are we going to suffer a surrender of this point? No, never! No, never!

Journal of Discourses 23:240-41, see 26:151-53, 20 August 1882.

Wilford Woodruff

We wont quit practicing Plural Marriage until Christ shall come.

John Henry Smith Journal, see Heber J. Grant Journal, 17 May 1888.

The Lord will never give a revelation to abandon Plural Marriage.

Minutes of the Quorum of Twelve Apostles, 12 December 1888.

Lorenzo Snow

Though I go to prison, God will not change His law of Celestial Marriage.

History of Utah, Orson F. Whitney, 1879.

Joseph F. Smith

There are, however, enough witnesses to these principles to establish them upon the earth in such a manner that they never can be forgotten or stamped out. For they will live; ... they are bound to prevail, because they are true principles.

Journal of Discourses 21:10, 7 December 1879.

Heber C. Kimball

The principle of Plurality of Wives never will be done away.
Journal of Discourses 3:125, 6 October 1855.

George Q. Cannon

To renounce the doctrine and promise not to obey the revelation - such an action - is impossible.
Juvenile Instructor 20:136, 1 May 1885.

Abraham H. Cannon

As God lives, the principle will not be driven from the earth.
Salt Lake Conference, 8 May 1887.

John W. Taylor & Owen Woodruff

They both prophesied "that it would never die out."
Letter from Bishop Heber Bennion to Orson F. Whitney, March 1931.

Charles W. Penrose

How can God withdraw an everlasting principle from the earth? He has not, and cannot.
Elder T.J. Rosser letter, 25 May 1908.

Children will Always be Born in Plural Marriage

John Taylor

He then set apart and placed us* under covenant that while we lived we would see to it that no year passed by without children being born in the principle of Plural Marriage.

John Taylor, 27 September 1886, Lorin C. Woolley Account, 22 September 1929.

** George Q. Cannon, John W. & Lorin C. Woolley, and later Joseph F. Smith*

Abraham O. Woodruff

...no year will ever pass, whether it be in this country [Mexico], in India, or wherever, from now until the coming of the Saviour, when children will not be born in Plural Marriage. And I make this prophecy in the name of Jesus Christ.

Quarterly Conference in Colonia Juarez, 18-19 November 1900, recorded by Joseph Charles Bentley (clerk), Journal and Notes p. 61.

After Owen Woodruff made his prophecy he turned towards Councselor Joseph F. Smith and said, "Now if I'm wrong, there sits the man who can set me right." President Smith did not correct him.

Orson P. Brown Interview, 2 March 1939. Kimball Young Papers.

Wayne Earl Carroll Oral History, interviewed by Marsha Martin, 1983

Marriner W. Merrill

...the time would never come when children of Polygamous parents would cease to be born in the Church.

Rudger Clawson Diary, 11 July 1899.

I am aware of the feeling growing among the people that plural families are unpopular. They are growing less. They will never die out. This principle will never be taken from the earth....There are some that think that the Church is going back on the principle, I tell them this is not so.

Anthon H. Lund Journal, 9 January 1900.

John W. Taylor & Owen Woodruff

I remember both John W. Taylor and Owen Woodruff (both Apostles) prophesying that it would never die out - that the time would never come when Polygamous children could cease to be born to the Saints.

Bishop Heber C. Bennion (Heber J. Grant's brother-in-law) to Orson F. Whitney, March 1931.

B.H. Roberts & Joseph F. Smith

He pounded the table and said, "There will never be a year go by, but what in some way, somehow, children will be born under that covenant." ... After this a resounding "Amen" came from Joseph F. Smith.

Douglas M. Todd Jr. (as told by his father), 28 November 1969, Most Holy Principle 3:330; 4:95.

Prophecies of "Another People"
Keeping Alive Celestial (Plural) Marriage

There will be a select group of Latter-day Saints that maintain the Gospel

But the time will come when the Lord will choose a people out of this people upon whom he will bestow his choicest blessing.

Heber C. Kimball, 9 November 1865, Journal of Discourses 11:145.

I know there is a people, in the hearts core of this people, that will arise in their majesty in a day that is near at hand, and push spiritual things to the front; a people who will stand up for God.

Orson F. Whitney, Deseret News,11 August 1889.

There are those remaining whom God hath reserved for perilous times, whose knees have never bowed to Baal, whose hands have never faltered, whose hearts have never trembled; those shall stand steadfast, firefooted as the rock upon which their hopes are built, and though the floods come and the rain descend and the winds blow and beat upon their house, it shall not fall.

Millennial Star 44:314, 15 May 1882.

Before the great day of the Lord shall come, and the day of righteousness and peace dawn upon this fair creation, two potent cleansing processes shall be in active operation. The first of these is the preparation of a choice people, purified by an application to their lives, as individuals and a community, of the the principles of the Gospel of peace. Such a body will evolve from those called Latter-day Saints, who as the Church, possess the fullness and power of the pure plan of salvation.

Millennial Star 42:585. (Note it does not say the Church possesses the fullness but some of those within it)

Such a people would come into existence because of the Church's rejection of Plural Marriage

Many of this people have broken their covenants by finding fault with the Plurality of Wives and trying to sink it out of existence. But you cannot do that. God will cut you off and raise up another people that will carry out his purposes in righteousness unless you walk up to the line in your duty.

Heber C. Kimball, Journal of Discourses 4:108.

What would be necessary to bring about the result nearest the hearts of the opponents of 'Mormonism', more properly termed the Gospel of the Son of God? Simply to renounce, abrogate or apostatize from the new and everlasting covenant of marriage in its fulness. Were the Church to do that as an entirety God would reject the Saints as a body. The authority would be withdrawn, with its gifts and powers, and there would be no more heavenly recognition of the administrations among the people. The heavens would permanently withdraw themselves, and the Lord would raise up another people of greater valor and stability, for his work must, according to His unalterable degrees, go forward, for the time of the second coming is near, even at the doors. Therefore, the Saints have no alternative but to stand by the truth and sustain what the heavens have established and propose to perpetuate. This they will do, come life or death, freedom or imprisonment, and there is, so far as we can observe, no use to attempt to disguise this fact.

Charles W. Penrose, Deseret EveningNews, 23 April 1885.

The entire Church and all of its Priesthood, with the Presidency at the head of it might motion and vote against this principle until doomsday with just one effect, (namely) to vote themselves away from the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, from the possession of their Priesthood, and to find themselves very speedily outside the Church and Kingdom of God; while he would raise up others that would honor and

observe his law.

Deseret News, Editorial, 1 April 1885.

The keys would be given to others if Plural Marriage Rejected

When this commandment was given, it was so far religious, and so far binding upon the Elders of the Church, that it was told them if they were not prepared to enter into it, and to stem the torrent of opposition that would come in consequence of it, the keys of the kingdom would be taken from them and given to others.

John Taylor, 7 June 1866, Journal of Discourses 11:221-222.

If we do not embrace that principle soon, the keys will be turned against us.

John Taylor, 10 October 1882, Life of Wilford Woodruff, Matthias F. Cowley, p. 542.

They would also be needed to maintain the Priesthood

The Lord Almighty will not suffer His Priesthood to be again driven from the earth, even should he permit the wicked to kill and destroy this people... God will preserve a portion of this people, of the meek and the humble, to bear off the kingdom to the inhabitants of the earth, and will defend his priesthood, for it is the last time, the last gathering time.

Brigham Young, Contributor 10:362.

The Priesthood in the last days is to be manifested in sufficient power to bear off the kingdom of God triumphant that all Israel may be gathered and saved. If all Israel will not be sanctified by the law which their Moses first offers them, they will peradventure receive a law of ordinances administered to them, not according to the power of endless life. Men will be saved in the last days as in former days, according to their faith and willingness to receive the word of God, and walk in it.

Franklin D. Richards, Millennial Star 16:36-37, 1853
Journal of Discourses 1:321; 2:4-5.

We receive the Priesthood and power and authority. If we make a bad use of that Priesthood, do you not see that the day will come when God will reckon with us, and he will take it from us and give it to those who will make better use of it.

Heber C. Kimball, Journal of Discourses 6:125.

A 'group' would be raised up because of the unrighteousness of the Saints

His word will go forth, in these last days, in purity; for if Zion will not purify herself, so as to be approved of in all things, in His sight, He will seek Another People ...

Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith, p. 18

Many will doubtless make shipwreck of their faith and will be led away by the allurements of sin into by and forbidden paths; yet the Kingdom will not be taken from this people and given to another. But a people will come forth from among us, who will be zealous of good works, willing to do the bidding of the Lord, who will be taught in His ways and who will walk in His paths.

Daniel H. Wells, Deseret News, 10 November 1875

And if we as a people do not hold ourselves on the altar, ready to be used with our means and all that God has bestowed upon us, according to the Master's bidding, for the upbuilding of his kingdom upon the earth, he will pass on and get somebody else; because he will get a people that will do it. I do not mean to say that he will pass on and leave this people; no, there will come up from the midst of this people that people that has been talked so much about.

Daniel H. Wells, Deseret News, 9 December 1882.

...if this Church, which is essaying to be the Church of Christ will not help us, when they can do it without sacrifice, with those blessings which God has bestowed upon them, I prophesy - I speak the truth, I lie not - God shall take away their talent, and give it to those who have no talent, and shall prevent them from ever obtaining a place of refuge, or an inheritance upon the land of Zion;

First Pres to Orson Hyde, 7 April 1834, History of the Church 2:48.

The kingdom of God is to be enjoyed by the Saints - those who are righteous, not those who are wicked. If we prove unworthy, Zion will have to be redeemed by our children, who may be more worthy, while we may be kept, like the ancient children of Israel, wandering in the wilderness, enduring hardships, persecution and trials, until we shall have suffered the penalty of neglected, not to say broken and unfulfilled covenants.

Joseph F. Smith, 2 April 1877, Journal of Discourses 19:26.

There must be a reformation, there will be a reformation among this people, for God will not cast off this kingdom and this people, but he will plead with the strong ones of Zion, he will plead with his people, he will plead with those in high places, he will plead with the Priesthood of this Church, until Zion shall become clean before him. I do not know but that it would be an utter impossibility to commence and carry out some principles pertaining to Zion right in the midst of this people. They have strayed so far that to get a people who would conform to heavenly laws it may be needful to lead some from the midst of this people and commence anew somewhere in the regions round about in these mountains.

Orson Pratt, 9 March 1873, Journal of Discourses 15:360-61.

There will be a people raised up, if we will not be that people - there will yet be a people raised up whose lives will embody in perfection the revelations contained in this book, who will live as the doctrines here taught require, as the laws here revealed show unto us, and they will be raised up, too, in this generation, and such a people will have to be raised up before Zion can be fully redeemed, and before the work of God can be fully established in the earth.

George Q. Cannon, 6 May 1883, Journal of Discourses 20:143.

Polygamists will save the Church

If God saves this people, as I firmly believe He will, it will be through those men and through those women whom men have placed under a ban; whom men have said shall have no power because of the laws that are enacted against them. I tell you, the salvation that will come to this people, will be through the faithfulness of the men of God and the women of God who, in the face of an opposing world, contrary to their traditions, to their education, to their pre-conceived notions and to the popular prejudices of the day - who have in the midst of all this stepped forward in the vanguard and obeyed the command of God, and have dared to endure all the consequences, and have been willing to endure all the penalties.

George Q. Cannon, 8 October 1882, Journal of Discourses 23:280.

If God has introduced something for our glory and exaltation, we are not going to have that kicked over by an improper influence, either inside or outside of the Church of the living God. ...

Some folks think that we polygamists are very much indebted to our brethren who are monogamists to help steady the ark to help save us, and that we need such men... We are not very much dependant very much upon the monogamists about any of these things... I will tell you, if you want to get along smoothly, you had better find among your various neighbours, when you have some matter of difficulty to settle, some of these polygamists and ask a little counsel at their hands.

John Taylor, 7 June 1874, Journal of Discourses 25:310.

There are men who say: “Yield this practice [plural marriage] for the present; perhaps public opinion may soften and then this principle may be taught and practiced.'

I look upon such a suggestion as from the devil. It would be quite as proper to propose apostacy for

a short season until public opinion would become more favorable to us. If there are any in the church who cannot stand the pressure, instead of talking compromise, let them withdraw quietly from the Church. If they can see nothing in the principle of celestial marriage worth contending for, leave those who do see and appreciate its value to fight the battle alone."

George Q. Cannon, Juvenile Instructor 20:156, 1885

Manifesto

Who wrote the Manifesto?

Author	Witness
Wilford Woodruff	Himself?
Charles W. Penrose	Matthias F. Cowley Thomas J. Rosser Ada L. Shepherd George Reynolds (in part)
George Reynolds (assisting)	Himself

Interestingly – although we now call the Manifesto Official Declaration 1, it was not the Church's first OD, that was written a year earlier by Charles W. Penrose! It too was spoken of as a "Manifesto"!

"I, Charles W. Penrose, wrote the Manifesto, with the assistance of Frank J. Cannon and John White. It's no revelation from God, for I wrote it. Wilford Woodruff signed it to beat the Devil at his own game."

25 May 1908, Bristol England Mission Conference, as related by Thomas J. Rosser to Robert C. Newson, in a letter written 4 August 1956.

The Bristol semi-annual conference was held May 24th [1908], in the Wolseley Hall, Eastville, Bristol. There were present President Charles W. Penrose, President C. G. Jarman and twenty-four traveling elders of the Bristol conference. After singing and prayer, President Jarman gave all present a hearty welcome. Expressed his appreciation at seeing so many saints and friends present from the outlying districts. ... Elders R. J. Walker, Thomas J. Rosser, Frank I. Hill and John H. Bawden gave reports of their respective branches. The reports were very encouraging.

Millennial Star 70:348.

Brother Penrose told me once in the city of Mexico, that he had written the Manifesto, and it was gotten up so that it did not mean anything and President [Joseph F.] Smith had told me the same.

Matthias F. Cowley, Minutes of the Quorum of the Twelve, 10 May 1911.

Ada L. Shepherd made a statement before William J. Barette, Notary Public, Salt Lake County, 7 December 1912, which stated she had heard Charles W. Penrose say it was he who wrote the Manifesto.

A World-Wide Survey of Present Day Mormonism..., 3 July 1913.

President Woodruff did not write the Manifesto. It was written by Charles W. Penrose, with the assistance of Frank J. Cannon and John White. After being prepared, it was submitted to a committee of non-Mormon Federal officials, among them Judges Charles S. Zane, C.S. Varian, O.W. Powers, and others. A change in the alleged facts set forth was insisted upon by these parties, the document recopied by a Mr. Green, a non-Mormon Federal clerk, when it was returned to President Woodruff and received his signature.

Joseph W. Musser, Truth 1:2:8, July 1935. [Son of Church Historian, A. Milton Musser]

The Editorial for the Deseret News in which the Manifesto first appeared admitted that the Manifesto had been condensed, and only "poorly" expressed "the sentiments of the writer." Charles W. Penrose was the editor of that newspaper.

Deseret News, 25th September 1890.

Among the many other individuals questioned during the Smoot Hearings was George Reynolds, who admitted that he and two others "had assisted in writing" the Manifesto:

Mr. Worthington: You said something about helping to write the manifesto. Will you explain that?

Mr. Reynolds: President Woodruff wrote it in his own hand--and he was a very poor writer, worse, I believe, than Horace Greeley -and he gave it into the hands of three of the elders to prepare it for the press. I was one of those three.

Mr. Worthington: Who were the three?

Mr. Reynolds: C. W. Penrose, John R. Winder, and myself.

Mr. Worthington: What did you do? You said you helped to write the manifesto, and I want to have an understanding of what you mean by that.

Mr. Reynolds: The answer came from the fact of the question coming to me whether I had read it and understood it, and I answered that I had assisted in writing it.

Mr. Worthington: Did you three, then, transcribe these notes of President Woodruff, or did you rewrite it, or what?

Mr. Reynolds: We transcribed the notes and changed the language slightly to adapt it for publication.

Mr. Worthington: It contained the substance?

Mr. Reynolds: Yes, it contained the substance.

Senator McComas: Did you, in transcribing the utterance of President Woodruff, make such change of phraseology as would make it ambiguous, so that it might apply to marriages subsequent and not to living with wives who had been married prior?

Mr. Reynolds: No, sir.

Senator McComas: It must have come to your mind when you were copying and changing the phraseology whether this is to apply to the future and whether the past is to be expected, did it not?

Mr. Reynolds: No, sir; I have told you honestly what my feelings and opinions were.

Senator McComas: It did not occur to you then?

Mr. Reynolds: No, sir.

Senator McComas: That required years?

Mr. Reynolds: Yes, sir. We wrote it as we understood the president intended, with his manuscript before us.

The Chairman: I do not know but I may have misunderstood. I understood this manifesto was inspired.

Mr. Reynolds: Yes.

The Chairman: That is your understanding of it?

Mr. Reynolds: My understanding was that it was inspired.

The Chairman: And when it was handed to you, it was an inspiration, as you understand, from on high, was it not?

Mr. Reynolds: Yes.

The Chairman: What business had you changing it?

Mr. Reynolds: We did not change the meaning.

The Chairman: You have just stated you changed it.

Mr. Reynolds: Not the sense, sir; I didn't state we changed the sense.

The Chairman: But you changed the phraseology?

Mr. Reynolds: We simply put it in shape for publication - corrected possibly the grammar, and wrote it so that -

The Chairman: You mean to say that in an inspired communication from the Almighty the grammar was bad, was it? You corrected the grammar of the Almighty, did you?

Reed Smoot Hearings 2:52-53

Was the Manifesto a revelation?

Was the Manifesto a revelation?

- Was not first document presented for such a concession
- The Lord does not identify Himself or 'speak' within the document
- It is addressed "to whom it may concern", and was sent first to the press and government
- The document itself was not presented to the Saints in Conference as a revelation
- No revelation exists upon which the Manifesto or upon which it is based
- Joseph F. Smith stated that he did not believe it to be a revelation
- It was the government who first insisted it be put in the scriptures[1]

When asked if the Manifesto was a revelation, "President Smith answered emphatically, no! He did not believe it to be an emphatic revelation from God abolishing plural marriage."

First Presidency Office Journal, 20 August 1891, Extensions of Power, Quinn, p. 34

I do not believe the Manifesto was a revelation from God, but was formulated by Prest. Woodruff and endorsed by his counselors and the Twelve Apostles for expediency to meet the present situation of affairs in the nation or those against the Church.

Marriner W. Merrill (Apostle), Journal, 20 August 1891.

The Manifesto was not a divine production but something manufactured to outwit the church's enemies

Apostle Charles W. Penrose, Thomas Jr Rosser was present in a missionary conference with Penrose in England 1908, as reported in Carmon Hardy, Solemn Covenant, 1992, University of Illinois Press.

Why in the world [did] President Woodruff ever make that Logan speech in which he declared the Manifesto to be a revelation? (Senator Reed Smoot to Apostle John Henry Smith) I don't know!!! (Response from Apostle Smith)

As reported by Senator Smoot's secretary, Carlos Ashby Badger Diaries, 19 Feb. 1905, Church Archives.

"The Manifesto issued in 1890 and adopted by the Church in Conference assembled, was not a revelation but was a statement drawn up by the leaders of the Church. ..."

Millennial Star 101:413, June 1939.

"To my knowledge there is no written revelation upon which the Manifesto was based."

Dean C. Jessee ("The Coming of the Manifesto," Kenneth Godfrey, Dialogue 5:3, Autumn 1970, p. 20)

Deseret News declares it is not a revelation

It has been shrewdly suggested to President Woodruff that it would be exceedingly profitable for him to have another revelation, declaring that the doctrine of polygamy should be no longer adhered to by the Saints.

... When President Woodruff receives anything from a Divine source for the Church over which he presides, he will be sure to deliver the message.

Utah Commissioner, Deseret News, 2 October 1980.

... revelation can only come, not when man wills, but when and how God wills. Such being the case, [the

1 It wasn't included in the Doctrine and Covenants until 1908, after the issue was brought up in the Reed Smoot hearings (Proceedings 1:107-8,226, 3:114,126).

Salt Lake Tribune and Anti-Mormons] must admit, if they are honest in their claims, that in the absence of revelation, President Woodruff's manifesto is all that they have any right to ask.

Charles Ellis, Deseret News, 4 October 1890.

What was the purpose of the Manifesto?

What was the purpose of the Manifesto?

- Apostle John Henry Smith suggested putting the principle aside for 5 years to gain statehood[2]
- An Apostle told a BYU Professor it was "a trick to beat the Devil at his own game"
- It was part of the concessions needed to gain statehood (a covenant with death and agreement with hell)

Reasons for -

- Weakness / sins / non-complaince of Saints
- The decision of the Saints
- To trick / placate the government

We formerly taught to our people that polygamy, or celestial marriage as commanded by God through Joseph Smith, was right; that it was a necessity to man's highest exaltation in the life to come. … To be at peace with the government and in harmony with their fellow citizens who are not of their faith, and to share in the confidence of the Government and the people, our people have voluntarily put aside something which all their lives they have believed to be a sacred principle,

19 December 1891, First Presidency Petition for Amnesty, Contributor 13:197; Smoot Investigation Vol 1, p. 18.

The reason the Manifesto was given and the principle laid aside was that many of those who entered into that principle were not keeping the commandments, and that not over two percent of the Latter-day Saints ever entered into that principle, and the Lord permitted the U.S. Government to pass the Edmund's Tucker law, a law restricting its practice.

Joseph F. Smith, Session of the Salt Lake Temple dedication, John Mills Whitaker Journal, April 1893, Similar remarks were made at the Wasatch Stake MIA Conference on 28 July 1901, as recorded in W.H. Smart's Diary.

At Wasatch Stake MIA Conference, remarks of Sister and President Joseph F. Smith: "Sister Smith bore a very strong testimony to the divinity of the principle of plural marriage. Pres. Smith endorsed it. He said it was taken away from the people - like the law of consecration - because the saints rejected it, and neither would be restored until there is a people prepared to live them. Anyone should beware that casts slurs upon the birth of those born under this covenant. Also that men who will not appreciate their wives and children and provide for them will lose them."

W. H. Smart Diary, 1901-1902 Bk; p. 94; 28 July 1901.

I wish to remind you of a certain revelation given you through President Taylor*. The command was given to set our quorums and houses in order, and the promise was that if we should obey the command God would fight our battles for us; but we did not obey the command and revelation given through President Taylor, [for if we did] there would have been no Manifesto.

*Matthias F. Cowley (Apostle), January 28th, 1901, Smoot Hearing 1:8. *Revelation to John Taylor, 25 December 1884; Unpublished Revelations 87:5-8, also Revelation to John Taylor, 13 October 1882; Unpublished Revelations 83:20-25*

I do not believe the Manifesto was a revelation from God, but was formulated by President Woodruff and endorsed by his counselors and the Twelve Apostles, for expediency, to meet the present situation of affairs in the nation or those against the Church.

Marriner W. Merrill (Apostle), Journal, 20 August 1891. At a meeting of the First Pres & Twelve

---

2 John Henry Smith to Joseph F. Smith, 3 Apr. 1888, J.H. Smith Letter books, U of U Library.

John W. Taylor: My view is that the Lord was anxious to put everybody upon his own responsibility and take the responsibility from the Church.
Francis M. Lyman: That is what the people have done and rejected the law of plural marriage.
The Excommunication Trial of Apostle John W. Taylor.

Mr. Wolfe: There was a meeting in the Brigham Young Academy, in Provo, Utah, that was addressed by B. F. Grant, a brother of Apostle Heber J. Grant. At that meeting Apostle John Henry Smith was present.
The Chairman: On what date was that; what year?
Mr. Wolfe: I don't remember the year. It was in the late nineties, probably.
Mr. Carlisle: It was after the manifesto?
Mr. Wolfe: Yes, sir; it was after the manifesto. On my way home I walked several blocks with B. F. Grant and Apostle Smith, and on the way we were talking about the conditions existing, and President Smith used these words to me: "Brother Wolfe, don't you know that the manifesto is only a trick to beat the devil at his own game?" (4:13)

12 Sept. 1890, in San Francisco, pro-Mormon Republicans tell Presidents Woodruff and Cannon that LDS church's only hope is to make "some announcement concerning polygamy and laying of it aside."
Mormon Hierarchy, p. 790, D. Michael Quinn.

How many voted for the Manifesto?

- Some members wrote in their journals that they voted against it, or did not vote
- Others wrote that the majority did not raise their hands in favour
- The Comprehensive History says "mostly unanimous"

When presented with this question during the October 1890 General Conference, the Saints did not all "answer alike" or "believe alike", as is very evident from the following six reports:

The vote in support of this motion [accepting the Manifesto] was nearly unanimous.
(CHC 6:222, as printed in the Des. News, weekly, Oct. 11, 1890)

[When the Manifesto was read to the assembled Saints] Silence prevailed until someone from the gallery called for a second reading. After this request was granted, Quorum of the Twelve President Lorenzo Snow moved that the declaration be accepted as "authoritative and binding". Many of the thousands in attendance abstained from voting.
(Mormon Polygamy: A History, Richard VanWagoner, p. 145)

Apostle Marriner W. Merrill noted in his 6 Oct. diary that the motion was "carried by a weak voice, but seemingly unanimous." *(Ibid., p. 145)*

I thought it a very slim vote considering the multitude assembled.
("Thomas Broadbent Diary," p. 24)

There were some of the people that did not vote.
(Heber J. Grant, Journal, 6 Oct. 1890)

"I am not ashamed of my action on the Manifesto. I voted 'no' in the Conference."
Statement of Representative William Gibson, Deseret Evening News, 28 March 1896, p. 1.

Although official accounts of this meeting [Oct. 6, 1890] state that the congregation voted unanimously to sustain the Manifesto, that was not the case. William Gibson, later a representative in the Utah legislature, voted against it. . . . The majority of the congregation refused to vote at all when the Manifesto was presented, . . .
"LDS Church Authority and New Plural Marriages, 1890-1904," Michael Quinn, Dialogue 18:1, Spring 1985, p. 48

Note: the Comprehensive History account in which it says "mostly unanimous"

An anonymous, undated, untitled typescript in the papers of Anthony W. Ivins provides what is probably the best description of what happened: "Both the members of the ch. & the genl. authorities for the most part voted for the manifesto with indiv. reservations"
Anthony W. Ivins Collection, box 7, fd. 10, p. 9, Uhi.

Brigham H. Roberts, who, reflecting on the propriety of presenting the Manifesto in conference at all, said: "During the Conference I saw that movements were on foot to have the whole people support it, a proceeding I viewed with alarm. When the crisis came I felt heart-broken but remained silent. It seemed to me to be the awfulest moment in my life, my arm was like lead when the motion was put; I could not vote for it, and did not."
Brigham H. Roberts, as quoted from a diary entry by Roberts on 10 Feb. 1893, in Walker, "B. H. Roberts and the Woodruff Manifesto," 365.

Church Leaders Reaction to the Manifesto

- Wilford Woodruff took an additional wife
- The majority of Apostles were involved in post-Manifesto Polygamy

L. John Nuttall, Secretary to the First Presidency (and a Stake President) performed the marriage between President Woodruff and Lydia Mamreoff von Finkelstein Mountford, on board boat in the Pacific ocean, on 20 September 1897.

D. Michael Quinn, Dialogue, Spring 1985, pp. 62-65

Joseph F. Smith admitted to breaking 'unlawful cohabitation' law

The Chairman: Do you obey the law in having five wives at this time, and having them bear to you eleven children since the manifesto of 1890?

Joseph F. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I have not claimed that in that case I have obeyed the law of the land.

The Chairman: That is all.

Joseph F. Smith: I do not claim so, and I have said before that I prefer to stand my chances against the law.

(Reed Smoot Case 1:197)

Apostles who took other wives
or performed plural marriages after the Manifesto –

Abraham H. Cannon	m. Lillian Hamlin - 11 Jan 1896
Rudger Clawson	m. Pearl Udall – 3 Aug 1904
Matthias F. Cowley	m. Harriet Bennion – 1899 & Leonora Taylor – 16 Sep 1905 *(dis'd 28 Mar. 1911, readmitted later)*
Heber J. Grant	tried to find another wife
Anthony W. Ivins	performed up to 1904
Anthon H. Lund	performed
Francis M. Lyman	performed
Richard R. Lyman	m. name unknown – 1925 *(ex'd 12 Nov 1943)*
Marriner W. Merrill	m. Hilda Erickson – 7 Apr 1901, performed up to 1905
John H. Smith	performed
Joseph F. Smith	authorised up to 1904
Lorenzo Snow	authorised up to 1901
John W. Taylor	m. Eliza & Rhoda Welling – 29 Aug 1901 & Ellen Sandberg – 28 Jun 1909 *(ex'd 28 Mar. 1911, reinstated 1965)*
George Teasdale	m. Letita Thomas – 17 May 1900
Orson F. Whitney	tried to find another wife as late as 1909
Abraham O. Woodruff	m. Eliza Clark – Jan 1901
Brigham Young, Jr.	m. name unknown – Aug 1901
<u>other leaders</u>	
George Reynolds	performed up to 1907 *(Pres of Seventy)*
B. H. Roberts	m. Margaret Shipp – 1894 *(Pres of Seventy)*
George H. Brimhall	m. Alice Reynolds – after Manifesto *(Pres of BYU)*

(see Solemn Covenant, Prof. B. Carmon Hardy & talk by D. Michael Quinn, August 1991)